



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

mission of the penances prescribed by the Church" (p. 51). So that if Dr. Wiseman prohibit the use of dripping, hard, or cheese, &c., on particular days, an "indulgence" by way of dispensation may be granted to permit us to indulge in these luxuries on the otherwise *banian* days; or if a particular penance be enjoined, such as saying so many "Ave marias" a-day, &c., this may be commuted into a fine, &c., &c.

So that indulgences, like the doctrine of the "real presence," as supposed to be taught by the Romish Church, is a myth, and the belief or disbelief of either, according to Veron, can be no possible objection to our being good "Catholics."

Your correspondent, "A Catholic Layman" (p. 33), complains of the diversities of opinion existing among English divines. Just let him read Veron's "Rule of Catholic Faith," and he would soon find himself bewildered in the multiplicity of opinions upon points he has doubtless considered long since settled; he may, according to Veron, give up his great prop "Infallibility" altogether. He will thank Veron for leading him safely to the harbour of refuge, which will enable him in safety to repudiate all that superstructure essentially Romish and he will find that Protestants are not such heretics after all.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,  
C. H. COLLETTE.

London, April, 1858.

#### THE HOLY FATHERS ACKNOWLEDGE THE SUPREMACY OF ST. PETER; AND THAT THE CHURCH OR THE FOUNDATION NEVER FAILS.

(Continued from page 35.)

Objection I.—"May not we fairly conclude that the text we have been discussing affords no ground for St. Peter's supremacy, and clearly was not considered so to do by the Ancient Fathers?" (C. LAYMAN, Feb. 19, p. 18<sup>e</sup>). Answer.—No doubt we might, had "the Ancient Fathers" stopped where you stopped them, and said no more on these texts.

II.—"That our Lord was speaking figuratively seems to us to be certain, and if so, why might He not build His Church as well on the faith confessed by Peter as on Peter himself?" (*Ibid*, Feb. 18, 1858, p. 22.) Answer.—I know not why He might not, but I know He did not, from His own words, where the word *faith* appears not; and if this, and St. Peter's supremacy, were not believed by the Council of Chalcedon, why, when St. Peter was called "the rock of the Catholic Church, and the foundation of the *orthodox faith*, was this proceeding sanctioned by all the bishops?" (Evangius. Hist. lib. ii. c. xviii.) Because, say you, "they were not so ill-bred as to interrupt" it. Answer.—Does this mean that our expression of dissent, when our faith is impugned, is silenced by "good breeding," and that religion is a mere farce? which would be good news for the Atheists; the conception is beautiful, and it is well if the practice does not follow. However, the Council of Chalcedon was before the year 1517, and therefore needed a Reformation to overawe it into the setting aside of our Lord's precept: "He who denies me before men, &c., for that of Lord Chesterfield.

You are still harping on that idle question of "where the supreme authority in matters of faith is lodged." The last words of Matt. xvi. 18 are chiefly relied on for this. See, then, how these words are understood by Origen in the passage above, and be satisfied with it. In every division the Catholic Church is found with the chair of Peter—there will I also be found. This is my text; it is quite clear, and visible as the Vatican. But you appeal to Scripture and to the ante-Nicene divines for your doctrine of the Trinity: you appeal from the living to the dead. On what authority is the conveyance of Scripture, or the knowledge that its true canon is neither more nor less than you have it? Is not the great Dr. Walton, when he tells you, in his *Prol-gomena*, that "the Revelation, and some other parts of the New Testament, were doubted of for some ages," far honest than the sixth Article, which, "In the name of Holy Scripture, understands those canonical books of the Old and New Testament, of whose authority there was never any doubt in the Church?" An instance of insincerity unparalleled even by the forgery of the Decretals, about which you talk so much. And as for the ante-Nicene writers, see how Origen speaks of the Son.

Before leaving the evidences of St. Peter's supremacy I must advert to other Scripture testimonies which ought not to be passed by. Thus, in the catalogues of the Evangelists he is not only the first named, but called "the first." "Now, the name of the Apostles are these, the first Simon, who is called Peter," &c.—Matt. x. 2. Secondly.—In Acts i. he evidently showed his authority; and again, in Acts xv., when "all the multitude were silent" (*ibid*. 12) after his speech; which was the first. For this I have SS. Jerome and Chrysostom for my witnesses.

St. Peter's supremacy being thus established, as well as the traditional fact that he occupied the episcopal chair at Rome (CATHOLIC LAYMAN, Jan. 15, 1858; p. 8), there is

no way of depriving the Bishops of Rome of their title to be his successors, except by proving that this part of the Divine institution was not to be continued. But we know, by tradition, that the other parts of our Saviour's institution were continued; and to make an exception to this would be only to show to what extremities even great wits may be driven before they will stand self-condemned. That the Bishop of Rome is the successor of St. Peter is the universal tradition of the Catholic Church.

The learned Dr. Pearson, Bishop of Chester, has fully proved this. (Oper. Posthum. p. 27-31, 1688, Lond.) In the second age, St. Irenæus says, "The great Church of Rome was founded by the glorious Apostles, SS. Peter and Paul, who delivered the episcopacy to Linus, whose successor was Anacletus," &c. (Lib. iii. c. 3.)

In the third century, St. Cyprian calls Rome "the chair of Peter," &c. (Ep. 55.)

In the fourth, St. Optatus: "In the city of Rome—Peter sat first, to whom Linus succeeded." (Lib. 2.)

In the same age, Eusebius: "After the martyrdom of Peter and Paul, Linus was the first who succeeded to the episcopate at Rome." (Hist. Lib. iii. c. 2.) "Linus was the first, after Peter, that obtained the episcopate at Rome." (*Ibid*, c. 4.)

Also, St. Epiphanius: "After (Peter and Paul) came Linus; then Cleus" (or Anacletus). (Lib. 1.)

And St. Augustine: "To Peter succeeded Linus," &c. (Ad Genesim.)

St. Jerome: "Clement was the fourth bishop of Rome, after St. Peter; for the second was Linus," &c. (Lib. Script. Ecclesiast. c. 15.)

St. Prosper, in the fifth century, calls Rome "the see of Peter." (Carm. de Ingratis.) See also St. Cyril of Jerusalem (Catech. 6); St. Ambrose (Lib. 4, Hexameron, c. 8.) &c., &c.

With many thanks for the CATHOLIC LAYMAN with which you have favoured me,

I remain, respected Sir,  
Yours, sincerely,

WILLIAM GERAGHTY, M.D.

[We have now printed, in our last number and the present, our correspondent's long string of quotations, though we confess we do not see what object they really serve, or how they contravene anything we have written.

That St. Peter is spoken of in very eulogistic terms, and deservedly so, by nearly all the fathers, we readily grant and never denied. That some of them treat him as the rock on which the Church is built we ourselves stated in our 5th article on the See of Peter, so far back as December, 1856. Nevertheless, it is equally true that there are many more passages in the fathers which interpret the same passage differently; and Dr. Geraghty has not yet attempted to disprove Father Launoy's assertion that 44 of the fathers treat the Church as built on the *faith* which Peter confessed, and not on Peter's person. Dr. Geraghty, indeed, in a note to his new letter, tries to make light of the distinction between St. Peter's person and the faith which he confessed, as one which "the Council of Trent lays no stress on," and which is a mere unmeaning distinction which some modern controversialists (meaning, we suppose, the CATHOLIC LAYMAN among others) have endeavoured to make for the sake of blinding (R.) Catholics.

Now, it does so happen that the distinction is not one started by us, or any other Protestant, for the purpose of blinding Roman Catholics, or otherwise; but first, we believe, suggested by St. Ambrose, in the very passage which, whimsically enough, Dr. Geraghty himself has quoted in the commencement of his present letter (p. 34, column 2, of our last number): "Not of Peter's self, but of his faith, was it said that the gates of hell, &c.;" and in modern times more fully pointed out by the learned Father Launoy, himself a staunch Roman Catholic, in an elaborate treatise in the 5th volume of his works, part 2, p. 99, in which he triumphantly exposes the uncandid and wilful misrepresentations of Cardinal Bellarmine, who had most unfairly represented all the fathers as agreeing in the interpretation that the Church was built on St. Peter alone.

As to the distinction being an unmeaning one, the assertion obviously refutes itself. Our blessed Lord was speaking figuratively as to the foundation on which He was about to build His Church, and no more significant or important distinction could be taken than whether the man He was addressing was to be made that foundation personally, as the modern advocates of Rome pretend, or whether the creed or confession of faith, which Peter had just professed, was to be the foundation. In the one case, Peter might be everything; in the other case nothing. The truth he confessed, and not the confessor, being the immovable "rock" on which the Church was to be founded just as we suggested in a former number<sup>1</sup> the Church of England may be said to be built on the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds, or the Church of Germany on the Confession of Augsburg.

Dr. Geraghty heaps together a number of quotations from the fathers, some of whom are of great note, others comparatively obscure, and of little weight in such a controversy. We might, perhaps, classify them thus.—

1st. Those which speak of St. Peter as him to whom the "keys of the kingdom of Heaven were given."

2nd. Those in which he is spoken of as the "rock" on which the Church was built, or to be built; and

3rd. Those in which he is spoken of as having "supremacy" over the universal Church—at least, according to Dr. Geraghty's translation of the passages.

As to the first, we must content ourselves with referring back to what we have already written in our fifth article on the See of Peter (5th vol. CATHOLIC LAYMAN, p. 136, December, 1856), where we showed by extracts from St. Jerome, Origen, St. Ambrose, St. Chrysostom, St. Augustine, and others, that all the Apostles, and not St. Peter alone, received "the keys of the kingdom of Heaven." As to the second class, we have already spoken; and as to the third, they appear to reduce themselves only to two passages—one from St. Chrysostom, the other from St. Augustine, in which the word "supremacy" occurs, at least in Dr. Geraghty's translations, and which may deserve or require a little more minute attention at our hands.

The first question will be, is the word *supremacy* the correct translation. The second: if so, whether that word was used by those eminent fathers in the same sense now contended for by the Church of Rome.

Let us first take St. Augustine, and see what is the word which Dr. G. translates "*supremacy*." The edition quoted by Dr. G. is not the ordinary Benedictine edition, nor, after consulting several reprints of that edition, have we been able to verify his references to T. iii., p. 2470, T. iv., p. 1733, given in his letter of last month, p. 34, column 3, there being no such pages in any edition that we have access to. We have, however, found in Tom. iv., p. 1215 (of the original Ben. Ed.; Paris, 1680), a passage in Psalm cviii. Enarratio. c. 1., which, we have no doubt, is that which Dr. G. refers to as in Tom. iv., p. 1733.

It is as follows:—

"For as some things are said, which may appear properly to appertain to the Apostle Peter, which are, nevertheless, not clearly to be understood, unless when they are referred to the Church, of which he is acknowledged to have been figuratively the personification, on account of the precedence (or primacy) which he had among the disciples, such as, 'I will give to thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven,' and such like; so Judas in a certain manner personified the Jews, who were enemies of Christ, who both then hated Him and now hate Him by succeeding perseveringly to Judas's impiety."

That is, as St. Peter was the foremost of all the disciples in good; so Judas was the first in evil. Peter was the personification of the Church, the true followers of Christ; Judas the personification of his enemies and their successors for ever.

What a passage to bring forward in proof of Papal supremacy. *Primatus* is the only word which gives the faintest colour to it, and we have already shown in our last number on the *precedency* of Rome that the "first place," or "primacy," no more proves power or jurisdiction, than the acknowledged primacy of Armagh proves jurisdiction in that see over the see of Dublin, or the primacy of Canterbury that its Archbishop is the ecclesiastical ruler of the Archbishop of York.

If the foregoing passage from St. Augustine were not clear enough in itself, his meaning would be made so by another passage on the same subject, which our readers may find in his 50th Treatise on St. John's Gospel, c. 12.—Ben. Ed., Paris, 1680, tom. iii., pt. ii., p. 633.

"When Peter received the keys, he signified the Holy Church; and if the good in the Church were signified in the person of Peter, so the wicked in the Church were signified in the person of Judas."

If there be, therefore, a "*supremacy*" of good in St. Peter, there is a "*supremacy*" of wickedness in Judas.

The only other passage in which supremacy is mentioned, according to Dr. Geraghty's translation, is from St. Chrysostom. It is taken from his 5th homily concerning penitence.—Tom. ii., p. 309 (lib.). Ben. Ed., Paris, 1718.

The word which Dr. Geraghty translates *supremacy* is *επιεξια*, which is a word of, at least, doubtful import, which, according to the most eminent lexicographers, signifies primarily mere "inspection," or "care;" though, occasionally, it may imply something more, "superintendence," or "command." In the present instance, it is clear from the context that the former is the meaning, as St. Chrysostom is treating of St. Peter's restoration after his triple sin of denying our Lord, and our Lord's command to "feed His sheep and lambs," where "*care*," and not "*rule*," was clearly the leading idea, as we have already shown in a former article—(CATHOLIC LAYMAN, vol. vi., p. 18.)

As to Dr. Geraghty's argument from the Council of Chalcedon, it appears to us, and will probably also appear to our readers, singularly infelicitous, if they will only take the trouble of refreshing their recollections on the subject, or, at any rate, of reading the brief account of some of the things said and done at that great Council, which we have given in another page of our present number, and which we think we may leave to speak for itself.

We must defer till some other occasion the Scripture testimonies as to the alleged supremacy of St. Peter,

<sup>1</sup> John xxi., 15, &c.

<sup>2</sup> 1<sup>st</sup> Matt.

<sup>3</sup> Matt. xvi. 13.

<sup>4</sup> 2<sup>nd</sup> Ed., Ev. gen. says, 620.

<sup>5</sup> Cap. W., sect. 6, p. 81.

<sup>6</sup> Matt. xxviii. 19, and John xx. 22, 23.

<sup>7</sup> See next page.

<sup>8</sup> Feb., 1858, p. 22.

which will form the natural subject of an additional article, supplementary to those which we have already published on the See of Peter; and we venture to anticipate that, if we have not altogether failed in our examination of the three great texts relied on by Roman Catholic writers—viz., Matt. xvi., 18, Luke xxii., 31, &c., and John xxi., 15, &c.—we shall not experience much difficulty in satisfactorily disposing of the minor passages now relied on.

As to the last few paragraphs of the above letter, in which, having to his own satisfaction disposed of the question of the supremacy of St. Peter over the rest of the Apostles, Dr. G. so trippingly attributes the same powers to the Bishops of Rome over all other bishops, we think we may safely spare ourselves the trouble of discussing them, not only because we have so largely gone into the matter upon former occasions, but because we venture to think that Dr. G. has much more to do before he can safely treat the preliminary question of "St. Peter's supremacy," as established to the satisfaction of our readers.]

## CHARGE AGAINST THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR,—I had not space enough at the end of my letter of yesterday to express how grieved I am, that at this, the very threshold of our controversy, the Editor of the CATHOLIC LAYMAN should forfeit the credit for sincerity to which, till yesterday, I believed him so well entitled. But here I must tell him, or whosoever he was who answered me in your last number, that with me his credit is gone, till he can offer some excuse for the shift which he used in order to evade the force of a passage<sup>a</sup> from St. Cyprian. The shift I allude to is this: He says, first, "We have the high authority of the Benedictine editors to show that Cyprian was not here speaking of St. Peter at all."<sup>b</sup> Where do the Benedictine editors show this? Now, sir, I must tell you that the credit of the CATHOLIC LAYMAN is at stake till you refer to the very page where the Benedictine editors assert that St. Cyprian is not here<sup>c</sup> speaking of St. Peter; or where they make the most distant allusion to what you charge them with. Secondly, my translation of this passage,<sup>d</sup> given *verbatim* at page 34,<sup>e</sup> is suppressed, and hinted at, in page 29, as being incorrect, and as being from the Benedictine edition, when it is from the Oxford edition, which has the word "Petrus," and which you do not acknowledge.

I must further tell you, that, if you deign to notice and reply to this charge, all recourse to "Launoy and his forty-four fathers" will here avail you not; for, first, all who read the evangelist agree that Christ built His Church on the "rock," in Matt. xvi., 18. Secondly, all scholars, whether Protestant or Catholic, agree that St. Cyprian in numerous places tells us that "Christ built His Church on St. Peter;" therefore, thirdly, it is, or should be, agreed by all scholars who are honest enough not to have recourse to artifice that St. Cyprian believed "the rock" mentioned by the evangelist<sup>f</sup> to be St. Peter, and him alone. Is it not, then, the height of insincerity to seek to evade the force of a decisive passage, where the saint again reiterates the same doctrine; and to have the presumption to tell learned Protestants and Catholics that St. Cyprian is not here alluding to St. Peter at all? Is this behaving fair and straightforward towards me, who, for the sake of pleasing you, rejected "the authority of the learned Benedictine editors," and brought against you your own Oxford edition? And if by this you are already driven to the wall, how would it have been with you now if, from the first, I had turned that "authority" against you, and, instead of replying to your objections against my religion, had put you to defend your own. Lastly, I need not tell you that except you give some excuse, or apology, or explanation for what you have imputed to the Benedictines, &c., our correspondence must cease.

I am, Sir, respectfully yours,

WILLIAM GERAGHTY.

[We are sorry, but not much surprised, to find Dr. Geraghty so early seeking for an excuse to break off the correspondence which he some months ago voluntarily commenced with us, and that, be it remembered, at a time when he did not, as he himself acknowledges in his supplemental letter of last month (p. 35), give us credit for the amount of sincerity which he felt forced to admit and acknowledge his respect for in that letter. We are not surprised, because we can well understand the difficulty in which he must feel himself placed, with respect to the arguments we have brought forward against the supremacy of Rome from his favourite writer, St. Cyprian,

and which, if he had no plausible excuse for not noticing, he would, of course, we presume, feel himself bound to attempt a reply to, which he might not find it so very easy to do. That his indignation is quite causeless, however, in the present instance, we can readily demonstrate, as we are prepared to prove that we used no *shift* or *evasion* or *misrepresentation* whatever in the matter he so angrily and dictatorially complains of.

How does the matter really stand?

The letter which we printed in our January number, p. 9, from Dr. Geraghty, among several other quotations, contained the following passage, ushered in, no doubt, in rather a sneering tone, but which, for the sake of fair and full discussion, we were ready to excuse:—

"You talk as confidently about what the Church of Carthage thought of Rome 1600 years ago as if you had just returned by railroad from consulting it. Indeed, if it thought as its Bishop, St. Cyprian, did (a thing not impossible), these same thoughts will be found to be of that awkward kind which had better be hushed up. For, first, that Church believed that, as 'there is one God, and one Christ, so there is but one Church, and one chair, by the mouth of Christ, founded on Peter.' (St. Cyprian, epist. 40 *pleb. suæ*.)"

This is *verbatim* the quotation of Dr. Geraghty, and he has himself in a subsequent letter (February number, p. 21) thanked us for the uncommon fidelity with which his letter of January was published.

The reference is plainly to the Benedictine edition, and that alone; for the epistle he quotes is not No. 40 in any other edition than the Benedictine, and he cites it only as epistle 40.

Yet he, in his present letter, asks us in the most taunting and bitter language is this behaving "fair and straightforward" toward him who, for the sake of pleasing us, rejected the authority of the learned Benedictine editors, &c., &c.

But, then, he asserts that we misrepresent the Benedictine edition, and says the credit of the CATHOLIC LAYMAN is at stake till we refer to the very page.

Be it so. The simple answer is, we have done so already. The edition we used is the Benedictine edition published at Venice in 1758, as we stated at the foot of column 2, page 29; and the page is 132 in that edition, as may be seen in the first note at foot of column 3, same page.

From page 132 of the Benedictine edition we cited the passage, in Latin, which he, Dr. Geraghty, had in his preceding letter purported to cite in English, but cited incorrectly, from the Benedictine edition, whether from the Venetian copy we, of course, cannot tell; but we believe there is no difference except that the notes of Baluze are placed at the foot of each page in the Venetian copy, while they are more prudently placed more out of sight by being relegated to the end of the volume in the Roman copy.

We are so far from thinking the passage at all a *decisive* one, even if Dr. Geraghty's version had been the true one, that we should have been, in truth, under but little temptation, if ever so dishonestly inclined, to evade its force by what he calls the "height of insincerity;" for the simple reason which we already stated (p. 29), viz., that as there was no necessary reference in it whatever to Rome, it could not have proved any supremacy in the Church of Rome, but would only have shown that Cyprian was among those fathers who interpreted the 16th Matt., v. 18, of the person and not the faith of St. Peter, having, however, no less than 44 fathers of the opposite opinion, as shown in vol. v., p. 135.

The Benedictine editors, however, *deliberately*, and, it will be seen, for good reason (whatever Bishop Fell may have thought, who published his edition many years before, and who, therefore, had not the benefit of their learning to assist him), give the reading, "super petram" (upon a rock), not "super Petrum" (on Peter); and the reason, as we stated, is given in Baluze's note upon the very words (super petram), viz., that the old editions and 17 ancient codices so render it, and that though Pamellius had followed Manutius in printing *Petrum*, instead of *petram*, he himself admitted that the latter reading was found in the ancient codices.

We were, therefore, quite justified in our conclusion, which was, we think, a very cautious and candid one, viz., that whether Baluze and the Benedictine editors, or Manutius (and we now add Bishop Fell), were right, is no great matter, as, when there are no less than 17 old MSS. extant giving a different reading, nothing could be more unsafe than to assume as indisputable that St. Cyprian was referring to St. Peter in the passage in question.

As to the argumentative charge that we are dishonest and resort to artifice, because he, Dr. G., is bold enough to assert that "all scholars, whether Protestant or Catholic, agree that St. Cyprian was of opinion that Christ built his Church on St. Peter," we merely reply that we were dealing *seriatim* with all the passages from St. Cyprian which he (Dr. Geraghty) relied on to prove this very assertion; and that, as each passage relied on in such an examination must be severally dealt with, it was neither "dishonest" nor an "artifice" to show that the words he quoted were at best of doubtful authority; consequently that whatever other passages (passages which we had either already considered, or were pledged to discuss before we have done with St. Cyprian) might prove, this

passage, at least, did not establish any part of Dr. G.'s argument.

We have only to add, though it could not possibly have made the slightest difference in our argument, that we were not at all applying ourselves to Dr. Geraghty's quotation from St. Cyprian, as cited in his letter, partially given in our March number, p. 34, where we now observe he refers to *both* editions (not solely to the Oxford one, as he now states), but had in our view merely the quotation as given in Dr. G.'s previous letter, which we had not been able to reply to fully, for want of space, in our January number. Though this may not satisfy Dr. G., who appears to be a little more irritable than a calm and candid controversialist ought, in our opinion, to be, we trust it will satisfy our readers that there never was a more groundless or insulting charge than that now made against us, for insincerity, unfairness, evasive shifts, artifice, suppression, and we know not how many more disreputable expedients, to blind Catholics, and mislead Protestants; and though we should be sorry to cut short any thing which Dr. Geraghty may think fit to say in reply to our arguments, or in support of his own, so long as there is any chance of the cause of truth being served by it, we hope he will in future write in a tone less offensive.

The subject on which Dr. Geraghty has thought proper to measure lances with us is the Supremacy of the Pope, or, if he prefers it, the Church of Rome. If Dr. Geraghty be, as we have no doubt he is, a sincere believer in that doctrine, let him send us an answer to our articles on the Ancient Churches, viz., that of Italy in October, 1857, that of Africa, in January, 1858, and of the East, in our present number, and we will gladly publish them, even should they prove that we have *misread* history, or drawn erroneous conclusions from it.]

## POPE VICTOR AND ST. IRENÆUS.

[The following extract from Dupin, we think, shows how little real power the Bishops of Rome had in the second century. Excommunicating another Church then meant merely refusing to hold communion with them, which it was in the power of any Church which disapproved of another to do.]

"Under the pontificate of Victor, the successor of Eleutherus, the controversy that arose between the Asiatic bishops and this pope gave occasion to St. Irenæus to use his utmost endeavours to re-establish peace. The subject of this dispute was to know on what day Easter ought to be observed. The bishops of Asia, according to their ancient custom, always celebrated that festival on the 14th of the moon of March, on whatever day of the week it happened; whereas the Western Churches waited for the Lord's day before they celebrated it. This difference in point of practice, which seems to be but of little consequence, produced some disturbance among the Churches of the first ages; and when St. Polycarp came to Rome in the time of Pope Anicetus, these two bishops earnestly endeavoured to accommodate this matter, but not being able to persuade one another to leave their former custom (so jealous have Churches always been of their ceremonies and customs), they parted very good friends, thinking that a difference of so little moment ought not to interrupt their mutual agreement. But under the pontificate of Victor this contest was revived with greater heat, and had well nigh caused a division in the Catholic Church; for this pope, incensed because the bishops of Asia, being very far from submitting to the threats and penalties which he had denounced against them, in case they refused to abolish their own custom and to conform to that of the Western Churches, had procured a large epistle to be written to him by Polycrates, Bishop of Ephesus, in vindication thereof, took a resolution to drive Polycrates and the Asiatic bishops out of their churches, and sent everywhere letters (says Eusebius), in which he declared them to be excommunicated. Whereupon the other bishops, and even those that celebrated the feast of Easter with those of the west, disapproved the proceedings of Victor, and wrote letters to exhort him to take other measures more conformable to peace and charity. But there was none that performed this with greater efficacy than St. Irenæus, who wrote an epistle to him under the name of the Church of France, wherein he declares, that though he himself solemnized the feast of Easter on the Lord's day, according to his manner, yet he could not approve of his undertaking to excommunicate whole Churches for the observance of a custom which they had received from their ancestors. He advertiseth him that different customs have been used in Churches, not only in the celebration of the festival of Easter, but also of fasts, and in divers other matters of practice. Lastly, he lays before him that his predecessor did not contend with the Asiatic bishops in this matter; and that St. Polycarp being arrived at Rome, and having holden a conference with Pope Anicetus touching this affair, they decreed that mutual communion and peace ought not to be broken for a matter of so small importance. It is probable that Victor was convinced by these reasons, for though the Asiatics did not lay aside their custom, yet it doth not appear that the union between them and the Bishops of Rome was thereupon discontinued. This epistle is produced by Eusebius, who affirms that this father wrote many others of the like nature to other bishops."—Dupin. Ecc. Hist. Vol. i., p. 74, Dublin Ed., 1723.

<sup>a</sup> Ad. Pleb. suam.

<sup>b</sup> P. 29. CATHOLIC LAYMAN. March, 1858.

<sup>c</sup> Where he uses the word "petram."

<sup>d</sup> "One Church and one chair founded by the mouth of Christ on Peter" (or on a rock).

<sup>e</sup> CATHOLIC LAYMAN, *ibid.*

<sup>f</sup> If I'm not mistaken; and if I am, correct me, and I will apologise.

<sup>g</sup> Lib. de Discip. virg., lib. de bono patient., lib. de Unitat. Eccles. Epist. 55, 70, 71, 73, &c.

<sup>h</sup> Matt. xvi., 18.

<sup>i</sup> Even Dr. Fell, the learned editor of the Protestant edition of St. Cyprian, if I remember rightly, in his note on this passage, refers it so far to St. Peter as to refer it to his faith, which is perfectly fair and honest, and even more than could be expected, seeing that the Council of Trent lays no stress on that distinction between St. Peter and his faith, which some modern controversialists, for the sake of blinding Catholics to the main thing, or his supremacy, have endeavoured to make.